



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/652,735	08/31/2000	Leif Einar Aune	28170-00022	3631
27045	7590	02/11/2004	EXAMINER	
			LEE, PHILIP C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	10

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/652,735	AUNE, LEIF EINAR	
	Examiner Philip C Lee	Art Unit 2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 January 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 11-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

1. This action is responsive to the amendment and remarks filed on January 24, 2004.

2. Claims 11-17 are presented for examination.

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. code not included in this office action can be found in a prior office action.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 11, 14 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schutte et al, U.S. Patent 6,178,455 (hereinafter Schutte) in view of Eikeland, U.S. Patent 5,828,837 (hereinafter Eikeland).

6. Schutte was cited in the last office action.

7. As per claims 11 and 16-17, Schutte taught the invention substantially as claimed for distributing IP-addresses in a General Packet Radio Service (GPRS) network (col. 22, lines 25-27), comprising:

a global processor in the GPRS network that stores a global pool of available addresses (Abstract; col. 3, lines 66-col. 4, lines 7); and
a plurality of application processors in external networks connected to the GPRS network (Abstract; col. 3, lines 66-col. 4, lines 7), each of the application processors being adapted to:

store blocks of IP-addresses in an internal pool of IP-addresses (col. 11; lines 50-53);

supply an IP-address from the application processor's internal pool to a user upon request (Abstract; col. 3, lines 66-col. 4, lines 7); and

request an additional IP-address from the global processor when the application processor's internal pool is empty or nearly empty (abstract; col. 16, lines 39-48);

wherein the global processor is adapted to transfer from the global pool to the requesting application processor, a block of IP-addresses comprising a plurality of IP-addresses in response to a request for an additional IP-address from the requesting application processor (abstract; 122, figure 1; col. 11, lines 61-64; col. 16, 39-48).

8. Schutte did not teach wherein the size of the blocks are dynamically adjusted to minimize the amount of traffic required to request and while ensuring that a sufficient number of blocks is available to serve all requests. Eikeland taught the size of the block

Art Unit: 2154

that is sent to the user are dynamically adjusted according to the amount of traffic (col. 5, lines 62-col. 6, lines 30).

9. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Schutte and Eikeland because Eikeland's method of dynamically adjusting the size of the block would increased the efficiency of Schutte's system by accounting for the network bandwidth thus minimizing transmission delay to normal network traffic (col. 2, lines 4-11).

10. As per claim 14, Schutte and Eikeland taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 11 above. Schutte further taught wherein the global processor is arranged to release addresses that have not been used in a preceding interval of time (col. 17, lines 49-64).

11. Claims 12-13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schutte and Eikeland in view of Wang et al, U.S. Patent 6,496,511 (hereinafter Wang).

12. Wang was cited in the last office action.

13. As per claims 12-13, Shutte and Eikeland taught the invention as claimed in claim 11 above. Schutte further taught wherein a given application processor is adapted to release a block of IP-addresses to users and notify the global processor of the release (abstract; col. 19, lines 19-30; col. 27, lines 6-20).

14. Schutte and Eikeland did not teach a means to release, if the number of addresses in the internal pool of an application processor exceeds a predefined limit. Wang taught a means to release the IP-address by predefining a customized function (col. 20, lines 25-29; col. 6, lines 55-64).

15. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Schutte, Eikeland and Wang because Wang's method of customizing a function for the means of release would increased usefulness of Schutte's and Eikeland's methods by allowing a user to predefine a customize event for triggering the release of IP-addresses.

16. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schutte and Eikeland in view of Antic et al, U.S. Patent 5,561,854 (hereinafter Antic).

17. Antic was cited in the last office action.

18. As per claim 15, Schutte and Eikeland taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 11 above in which each application processor is arranged to store the internal pool of IP-addresses in Random-Access Memory (RAM) (col. 9, lines 12-17).

19. Schutte and Eikeland did not teach making back-up copies of the internal pool on a persistent storage medium with regular intervals. Antic taught the method of making

Art Unit: 2154

back-up copies of the home location register on a persistent storage medium with regular intervals (col. 3, lines 17-31).

20. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Schutte, Eikeland and Antic because Antic's method of making back-up copies of data would increased the reliability of Schutte's and Eikeland's method by allowing the application process to restore the pool of IP-addresses in the event of a crash in the GPRS network (col. 1, lines 36-39).

21. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 11-17, filed 1/24/04, have been fully considered but are not deemed to be persuasive and are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

22. In the remark applicant argued that

- (1) in claims 11 and 16-17, the cited arts fail to teach dynamically adjusting the size of the block that is sent.

23. In response to point (1), in claims 11 and 16-17, Schutte did not teach wherein the size of the blocks are dynamically adjusted to minimize the amount of traffic required to request and while ensuring that a sufficient number of blocks is available to serve all requests. Eikeland taught the size of the block that are sent to the user are dynamically adjusted according to the amount of traffic and ensuring that a sufficient number of blocks is available to serve all request for the users (col. 5, lines 62-col. 6, lines 30).

24. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

25. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip Lee whose telephone number is (703) 305-7721.

27. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Philip Lee



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100